

## **Remarks**

### **Response to Notice of Non-responsive Amendment**

The Applicant filed a Response on September 29, 2004 in a bona fide effort to respond to the Office Action dated June 29, 2004. The Examiner has replied with a Notice of Non-Responsive Amendment because Claim 9 in the listing of claims does not include the proper identifier in a parenthetical expression as required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(c).

The Response is hereby resubmitted with the correction to Claim 9, which now includes the proper identifier in a parenthetical expression, namely --(Currently Amended)--, as required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(c).

### **Status of Claims**

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration. Claims 1, 5, 8-9, 17, and 19-20 have been amended. Claims 2-4, 6-7, 10-16 and 18 remain in the application unchanged. No new matter has been added.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1 and 8 are objected to due to lack of antecedent basis for the following limitations:

Claim 1 recites the limitation "which said cable is routed" in lines 5-6. This limitation has been removed from Claim 1.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "of said computer housing" in lines 4-5. Claim 8 has been amended to replace this limitation with --of said housing--.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the objections to claims 1 and 8 are now overcome.

### ***Claim Rejections***

Claims 1-16, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jacobowitz et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,304,969).

Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobowitz et al. in view of Bossard et al. (U.S. Pat. No.

4,805,979).

The Examiner's rejections of the claims are respectfully traversed.

***Response to Rejections of Claims***

***a. Claims 1-7***

Applicant's claim 1 recites:

A cable routing tray for routing external cabling of an electronic device, comprising:  
a body;  
a cable routing channel formed on said body, said cable routing channel comprising an ingress for receiving an external cable, an egress for outputting said external cable, and a guiding path therebetween for removably routing said external cable between said ingress and said egress.

***The Jacobowitz Reference***

The Examiner cites Jacobowitz as anticipating claim 1. In particular, the Examiner seeks to equate the Thermal Conduction Module (TCM) 10 of Jacobowitz with Applicant's recited "body", the guide member 169 of Jacobowitz with Applicant's recited "cable routing channel", and cable 23 of Jacobowitz with Applicant's "cable". The Examiner further states that Figures 5 and 6 illustrate that the guide member 169 comprises includes an ingress and an egress and a guiding path therebetween.

Jacobowitz discloses a TCM 10 with an electrical transmission-line interface. On a substrate (40) having semiconductors (50), a driver or receiver circuit is provided to interface with an electrical transmission-line (23). Integral means for the electrical transmission line alignment, support and transit through a sealed environment are also provided. A fluid tight seal is also provided for the various components that are in the interior of the housing. (Jacobowitz, Abstract).

In contrast, Applicant's claimed invention is directed at a cable routing tray for routing external cables of an electronic device from one face of the device to another.

Jacobowitz does not teach or suggest a "cable routing channel comprising an ingress for receiving an external cable, an egress for outputting

said external cable, and a guiding path therebetween for removably routing said external cable between said ingress and said egress". Jacobowitz teaches "integral means for the electrical transmission line alignment, support and transit through a sealed environment". (Jacobowitz, Abstract). To construct the TCM 10, a retainer 151 is used to securely accommodate the spirally wound integral delay line 71 within the coaxial cable guide channel 169 (Jacobowitz, col. 8, lines 33-37), and the retainer 151 and channel 169 are sealed within the TCM 10 by substrate 40, lower frame 12, seal frame 14, and upper frame 16. As shown in Jacobowitz, Figures 1 and 7, once the TCM 10 is assembled, the transmission line 23 is permanently sealed within the TCM 10. Accordingly, the transmission line 23 within the channel 169 cannot be considered "external" to the TCM 10 as required by Applicant's Claim 1. Further, the channel 169 cannot be equated with "a guiding path therebetween for removably routing said external cable between said ingress and said egress" as required by Applicant's Claim 1 since when the TCM 10 is assembled, the transmission line 23 cannot be removed and therefore the channel 169 does not allow "removably routing said external cable between said ingress and said egress".

Under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 827 (1987). Since Jacobowitz does not meet each and every limitation of Applicant's claim 1, per *Verdegaal Bros., Inc.*, *supra*, Jacobowitz cannot be used in formulating an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

### ***The Bossard Reference***

Bossard discloses a fiber optic splice closure for protecting the splice made into a transmission cable. Bossard does not make up for the deficiencies of Jacobowitz in meeting Applicant's Claim 1. In particular, Bossard also does not teach "a cable routing channel formed on said body, said cable routing channel comprising an ingress for receiving an external cable, an egress for outputting said external cable, and a guiding path

therebetween for removably routing said external cable between said ingress and said egress". In Bossard, the channel is formed by mating the base 16 and cover 17. The channel is therefore formed within the base 16 and cover 17 when assembled and not "on said body" as required by Applicant's claim 1. Further, when the closure assembly 15 is assembled, the channel formed between the base 16 and cover 17 cannot be equated with "a guiding path therebetween for removably routing said external cable between said ingress and said egress" since the fiber optic cables cannot be removed without disassembling the closure assembly 15. Accordingly, Jacobowitz even in combination with Bossard does not meet the limitations of Applicant's claim 1.

#### ***The Gretz Reference***

Gretz discloses a cable support which provides a curved surface over which the cabling is laid and provides means to permit separation of individual cables to inhibit their shifting within the support. Gretz does not make up for the deficiencies of Jacobowitz and Bossard in meeting Applicant's Claim 1. In particular, Gretz also does not teach "a cable routing channel formed on said body, said cable routing channel comprising an ingress for receiving an external cable, an egress for outputting said external cable, and a guiding path therebetween for removably routing said external cable between said ingress and said egress". In Gretz, cables are laid over a curved surface to support the cables. The cable support does not include an ingress, an egress, or a guiding path therebetween for routing the cables. Accordingly, Jacobowitz even in combination with Bossard and/or Gretz, does not meet the limitations of Applicant's claim 1.

#### ***The Norris Reference***

Norris discloses a cable tray in which cables are hung on hangers. Norris does not make up for the deficiencies of Jacobowitz and/or Bossard and/or Gretz in meeting Applicant's Claim 1. In particular, Gretz also does not teach "a cable routing channel formed on said body, said cable routing channel comprising an ingress for receiving an external cable, an egress for outputting said external cable, and a guiding path therebetween for removably routing said external cable between said ingress and said egress".

Accordingly, Jacobowitz even in combination with Bossard, Gretz, and/or Norris does not meet the limitations of Applicant's claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the prior art of record teaches the invention as claimed in Applicant's Claim 1. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn and that claim 1 is now in position for allowance.

Claims 2-7 each depend from independent base claim 1 and add further limitations. For at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is not shown, taught, or disclosed by the cited references, Claims 2-7 are likewise not shown, taught, or disclosed. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 2-7 should be withdrawn.

***b. Claims 8-18***

Amended claim 8 now recites:

An electronic instrument comprising:  
a housing;  
an electrical connector positioned on a first face of said housing;  
a first cable routing channel formed on a second face of said housing, said second face adjacent to said first face of said housing, said cable routing channel comprising:  
an ingress in proximity to said electrical connector for receiving an external cable,  
an egress in proximity to a third face of said housing for outputting said external cable, and  
a guiding path connecting said ingress and said egress for removably routing said external cable between said ingress and said egress.

Claim 8 recites similar limitations to claim 1, including "an external cable" and a "cable routing channel" comprising "a guiding path connecting said ingress and said egress for removably routing said external cable between said ingress and said egress". For at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is not shown, taught, or disclosed by the cited references, Claim 8 is likewise not shown, taught, or disclosed. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 8 should be withdrawn.

Claims 9-18 each depend from independent base claim 8 and add further limitations. For at least the same reasons that Claim 8 is not shown, taught, or disclosed by the cited references, Claims 9-18 are likewise not

shown, taught, or disclosed. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 9-18 should be withdrawn.

***c. Claims 19-20***

Amended claim 19 now recites:

A method for routing an external cable attached to an electronic connector mounted on a first face of an electronic instrument to a second face of said electronic instrument, comprising:

providing on said instrument a routing channel from said first face of said electronic instrument to said second face of said electronic instrument, said routing channel comprising an ingress in proximity to said electrical connector for receiving said external cable, an egress in proximity to a third face of said housing for outputting said external cable, and a guiding path therebetween for removably routing said external cable between said ingress and said egress.

Claim 19 recites similar limitations to claim 1, including “an external cable” and a “routing channel” comprising “a guiding path therebetween for removably routing said external cable between said ingress and said egress “. For at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is not shown, taught, or disclosed by the cited references, Claim 19 is likewise not shown, taught, or disclosed. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 19 should be withdrawn.

Claim 20 depends from independent base claim 19 and adds further limitations. For at least the same reasons that Claim 19 is not shown, taught, or disclosed by the cited references, Claim 20 is likewise not shown, taught, or disclosed. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 20 should be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that none of the references cited by the Examiner taken alone or in any combination shows, teaches, or discloses the claimed invention, and that Claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this amendment, or should the Examiner believe that it would further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jessica Costa". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

February 9, 2005

Jessica Costa, Reg. No. 41,065

The Law Offices of Jessica Costa, PC  
P.O. Box 460 Crozet, VA  
22932-0460  
(434) 823-2232  
(434) 823-2242 (fax)